

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached sheet of drawings includes changes to Figs. 1 and
3

In Fig. 1, reference number 103 has been added to
identify the intersection of 110 and 112.

In Fig. 3, reference number 10 has been added to identify
the microphone.

REMARKS

In regard to paragraph 1 of the office action, attached are amended Figs. 1 and 3 and the description has been amended above to overcome the examiner's objection. A paragraph has been added to page 8 above to identify the intersection 103. No new matter has been added. The added paragraph is almost identical to the description on page 2, second full paragraph.

In regard to claim 13, the examiner is requested to reconsider the objection. Claim 13 claims a handheld telecommunications device. This was not claimed in claim 1. Thus, claim 13 is not claiming the exact same apparatus as claimed in claim 1; it further limits the casing of claim 1 to being part of a handheld telecommunications device. The examiner's attention is drawn to MPEP 2173.05(f). Claim 13 would be understood by a person skilled in the art. The examiner is requested to withdraw his objection to claim 13.


In regard to sections 3-5 of the office action, the claims have been amended above to overcome the examiner's rejections.

In regard to section 6 of the office action, claim 14 has not been amended for the purposes of overcoming the examiner's rejection. The claim would be understood by a person skilled in the art after reading the patent application. The examiner has pointed to nothing that would indicate otherwise. The examiner is requested to reconsider his rejection of claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

Claim 16 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Sekine et al. (US 6,336,037). Claims 1-3 and

7-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sekine et al. (US 6,336,037). Claims 4-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sekine et al. (US 6,336,037) in view of Kulberg et al. (US 5,850,612). The examiner is requested to reconsider these rejections.

Claim 3 has been cancelled and its features have been added to claim 1. Claim 1 now claims that the face has one elongate diagonal and one truncated diagonal. Figs. 5 and 8 of Sekine et al. merely appear to show a face having a box-like rectangular shaped face. Thus, as shown below in the marked-up illustration of Fig. 8, in this perspective view the diagonal X appears to be the same size as the diagonal Y.



There is no disclosure or suggestion of X being larger than Y. This is merely an optical illusion from the perspective view. Claim 1, on the other hand, claims that the face has one

elongate diagonal and one truncated diagonal. As can be seen from the marked-up Fig. 1 below showing a front plan view of one embodiment of the casing, diagonal X' is longer than diagonal Y'. X' is an elongated diagonal of the face. Y' is a truncated diagonal of the face.




FIG. 1

There is no disclosure or suggestion in Sekine et al. of applicants' claimed face having one elongate diagonal (such as X' shown above) and one truncated diagonal (such as Y' shown above). Therefore, claim 1 is not obvious in view of Sekine et al. Claim 1 is patentable and should be allowed.

Though the claims dependent upon claim 1 contain their own allowable subject matter, these claims should at least be allowable due to their dependence from allowable claim 1. However, to expedite prosecution at this time, no further comment will be made.

Independent claim 16 has been amended above to clarify applicants' claimed invention. Claim 16 claims that the face has an elongate diagonal between a first pair of opposite corners and a relatively shorter truncated diagonal between a second pair of opposite corners. Again, there is no disclosure or suggestion of X being larger than Y in Fig. 8 of Sekine et al. as marked up above. This is merely an optical illusion from the perspective view. Sekine et al. does not disclose or suggest a face which has an elongate diagonal between a first pair of opposite corners and a relatively shorter truncated diagonal between a second pair of opposite corners. Therefore, claim 16 is not obvious in view of Sekine et al. Claim 16 is patentable and should be allowed.

Claims 19-23 have been added above to claim the features recited therein.

For all of the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now present in the application are clearly novel and patentable over the prior art of record. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested. Should any unresolved issue remain, the examiner is invited to call applicants' attorney at the telephone number indicated below.



App. No.: 10/563,591
Reply to Office Action of: 09/30/2008

Respectfully submitted,

Mark F. Harrington 12/17/08
Mark F. Harrington (Reg. No. 31,686) Date

Customer No.: 29683
Harrington & Smith, PC
4 Research Drive
Shelton, CT 06484-6212
203-925-9400

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail on the date shown below in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner For Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

DEC. 17, 2008
Date

Paul Murray
Name of Person Making Deposit